G. C. Neiderhiser 912 W. Milborn St. Marion, IN 46952-1355

November 20,2002

Federal Communications Commission

Washington

TO THE COPY ORIGINAL

DOT TO THE MILE COPY ORIGINAL

DOT TO THE MILE COPY ORIGINAL

Washington DC 20554

Subject: FCC Docket No. 02-278

Gentlemen:

Please, please do not do anything to weaken Indiana's Telephone Privacy Law!

For the first time in years I've been able to answer the telephone and know that it is a call for me from family, friends or someone I know.

For the first time in years I haven't scrambled to answer the phone only to have someone trying to sell me aluminum siding, windows, stocks/bonds or wanting me to donate to an agency for every imaginable disease or unfortunate being.

I don't mind sales pitches coming to me in the mail. You make one trip to the mailbox, gather it all up and can decide whether or not to consider it or toss it. When telemarketers ring into your home any time of day or night, you have to answer the phone; it might be someone in the family trying to reach you with an emergency or crisis.

The Indiana Telephone Privacy Law is the best thing our legislature has done for Indiana residents in years and years! If the FCC changes the Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991, we'll go back to the constant harassment of telemarketers.

Please don't take away a good thing that didn't cost taxpayers a dime!

Geraldine C. Neiderhiser

Continuer

Confirmed DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL DEC 1 1 2002 DEC 0 9 2002 Distribution Center FCC. 11-28-02 ToWhom it May Concern I can writing in requards to CORochet #02-278 il wont my voice heard loudand clear about tela matheteto Calsing my home Il never and il mean WEVER to have them call me about any thing any time from any where this CG Docher 02-278

**Patrick Craighead** 

\$190° . 30° .

3010 Deland Road Waterford, Michigan 48329 U.S.A Home Phone 248 674-3836 Email patrickcraighead@comcast net

November 29, 2002

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Office of the Secretary, Federal Communications Commission 445 12th Street **S.W.** Washington, D.C. 20554

Regarding: CG Docket No. 02-278

I read in our local newspaper that the **FCC** would like to hear from the American people what we think about telemarketers. I'm not sure who is responsible for starting this intrusive advertising scheme, but I do not agree with this method for the following reasons:

- I I pay for my phone service for personal use only, paying extra for a unlisted number has **no** effect on telemarkelers contacting you.
- 2. Blocking Telemarketers cost you extra. buying gizmos and services that will eventually be defeated **by** these rude solicitors is unfair to the consumer.
- 3. I work a midnight shift therefore the current allowable calling times 8:00a.mto 9:00p.m. fall into my rest time. This means I have to disconnect my phone when I want to get an undisturbed sleep. My family knows not lo call during the day, but if their was an emergency they wouldn't be able to contact me because I've been forced to unplug my phone
- 4 People that are older, underage or mentally challenged are victims of telemarketing, these people need supenision from trusted family members or friends when making purchases.

5. STOP TELEMARKETING COMPLETELY. MY PRIVACY IS BEING VIOLATED

Sincerely,

Patrick Craighead

Fatered Cany

Confirmed

DEC 1 1 2002

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

November 20, 2002

FCC 445 12<sup>th</sup> St

Waslungton, DC 20554

This letter is to express concerns of a proposed rule change for a national "do not call" list. !believe that consumers should be made aware of their rights under the current laws.

I believe that preemption is necessary to make clear one set of rules, that all companies can adhere to By doing this the consumer will still not receive unwanted telemarketing calls. It will also give legitimate businesses one set of guidelines to follow, vs each state having unique and specific regulations.

I hope the commission will realize the needs of the consumer and set national regulations that businesses can comply with Preemption of the proposed rule is necessary to guarantee there is no confusion by consumers and businesses alike, because of states different policies

Sincerely

Larry Casebere PO Box 11488

Fort Wayne, IN 46858

Confirmed

DEC 1 1 2002

OOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

November 20,2002

FCC 44s 12<sup>th</sup> St Washington. DC 20554

This letter is to express concerns of a proposed rule change for a national "do not call" list. I believe that consumers should be made aware of their nghts under the current laws

I believe that preemption is necessary to make clear one set of rules, that all companies can adhere to By doing this the consumer will still not receive unwanted telemarketing calls. It will also give legitimate business's one set of guidelines to follow, vs. each state having unique and specific regulations.

I hope the commission will realize the needs of the consumer and set national regulations that business's can comply with Preemption of the proposed rule is necessary to guarantee there is no confusion by consumers and business's alike, because of states different policies.

Sincerely

4835 Fallbrook Ln Bldg 20

Fort Wayne, IN 46835

Confirmed

DEC ( 2002

DOCKET FILE COPY DRIGINAL

Confirmed

DEC I T SOOS

November 12, 2002

**ECC** 

P2205 DQ, notgnidzeW 445 12 Th. Succt

letribution Center

available to them. support to ensure consumers are aware of their rights under current law and aware of the protections This letter is to provide comment on a proposed rule change for a national do not call list. I am in full

unitable states with multiple rules. elemarketing calls and a business will have one set of guidelines to follow vs. the complexities of set of risks, that a legitimate business can follow. By doing this the consumer will thwart unwanted After careful resconing I have came to the conclusion that preemption is necessary to establish one

STALES is necessary to ensure that there is no confusion of the differing guidelines set forth by the different reasoning of a business to adhere to the guidelines. It is my conclusion premiion of the proposed rule Lurge the commission to take into consideration the balance of consumers needs and the practical

Jansen R. Beneg Goos Gostehread

Indienopolis, In Yazzo

\*\* TOTAL PAGE. 02 \*\*

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

November 20, 2002

002

02-27)

445 12th St

Washington, DC 20554

This letter is to express concerns of a proposed rule change for a national "do not call" list. I believe that consumers should be made Jurare of their rights under the current laws

I believe that preemption is necessary to make clear one set of rules, that all companies can adhere to By doing this the consumer will still not receive unwanted telemarketing calls. It will also give legitimate business's one set of guidelines to follow, vs. each state having unique and specific regulations.

1 hope the commission will realize the needs of the consumer and set national regulations that business's can comply with. Preemption of the proposed rule is necessary to guarantee there is no confusion by consumers and busmess's alike, because of states different policies

Sincerely,

Tom Meiser

8532 Manor Dr

Fort Wayne, IN 46825

Confirmed

DEC 1 ( 2002

November 14, 2002

FCC 445 Twelfth Street Washington, DC 20544 7750 3 5 2002 J

DOCKET FILE COPY OFIGINAL

lain in favor of legislation regarding the national telemarketing bill (CG 02-278)

In time this will clean up telemarketing only people and companies with the best interest of the business and homeowners they are calling will be allowed to. I look forward to the day telemarketing will he done with honor, honesty, inegrity.

Sincerefy.

Roosevelt Harris

Confirmed

DEC 1 1 2002